



## Advisory Design Panel Report For the Meeting of October 24, 2018

---

**To:** Advisory Design Panel **Date:** October 12, 2018  
**From:** Leanne Taylor, Senior Planner  
**Subject:** Development Permit with Variance Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road

---

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Advisory Design Panel (ADP) is requested to review a Development Permit Application for 953 Balmoral Road and provide advice to Council.

The proposal is to construct a four-storey multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 11 rental units. The following policy documents were considered in assessing this Application:

- *The Official Community Plan (OCP, 2012)*
- *Downtown Core Area Plan (2011)*
- *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters (2010)*
- *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings (1981).*

Staff are looking for commentary from the Advisory Design Panel on the following items:

- overall size, scale and massing of the building
- window size, shape and placement of the building
- landscaping and outdoor open space
- residential entryways and articulation along the building base
- the transition between the public and private realm.

The Options section of this report provides guidance on possible recommendations the Panel may make, or use as a basis to modify, in providing advice on this Application.

### BACKGROUND

**Applicant:** Mr. Rajinder Sahota  
Method Built Homes

**Architect:** Ms. Pamela Úbeda, MAIBC  
Coast and Beam

**Development Permit Area:** Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed Use Residential

**Heritage Status:** N/A

## Description of Proposal

The proposal is to construct a four-storey multi-unit residential building consisting of approximately 11 rental units. The development has a proposed floor space ratio (FSR) of 1.38:1. Concurrent with this Application is Rezoning Application No. 00598. The proposal includes the following major design components:

- low-rise building form containing contemporary-style design features, including a flat roofline, larger windows on the third and fourth storeys, and modern finishes
- exterior materials include brick, wood siding, stucco and aluminium privacy screen
- third and fourth storeys stepped back 2m
- one ground floor unit with a front entrance facing the road
- recessed main entrance into the building
- gated entryway into the site and to access the parking in the rear yard
- permeable pavers for driveway and surface parking lot
- no soft landscaping
- a bike room for 16 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces, and a bicycle rack for six bikes near the front entrance.

The following data table compares the proposal with the existing R-2 Zone, Two Family Dwelling District, as well as the R3-1 Zone, Multiple Dwelling District, which is seen as a comparable zone as it anticipates similar uses at a similar density. However, there are still numerous aspects of the proposal that would still not meet the requirements of the R3-1 Zone. An asterisk is used to identify where the proposal is less stringent than the R3-1 Zone.

Zoning Criteria	Proposal	Existing R-2 Zone	Zone Standard R3-1 Zone	OCP Policy	DCAP
Site area (m <sup>2</sup> ) – minimum	<b>671.50 *</b>	555.00	920.00		
Density (Floor Space Ratio) – maximum	<b>1.38:1 *</b>	0.50:1	1.20:1	2:1	2:1
Total floor area (m <sup>2</sup> ) – maximum	<b>929.50 *</b>	280.00	805.80		
Lot width (m) – minimum	15.48	15.00	n/a		
Height (m) – maximum	12.19	7.60	18.50		
Storeys – maximum	4.00	2	6	6	6
Site coverage (%) – maximum	<b>43.00 *</b>	40.00	30.00		
Open site space (%) – minimum	<b>15.30 *</b>	30.00	30.00		
<b>Setbacks (m) – minimum</b>					
Front	<b>2.00 *</b>	7.50	10.50		

Zoning Criteria	Proposal	Existing R-2 Zone	Zone Standard R3-1 Zone	OCP Policy	DCAP
<b>Setbacks (m) – minimum</b>					
Rear	10.85	15.20	6.10		
Side (east)	<b>1.52 *</b>	1.55	6.10		
Side (west)	<b>3.64 *</b>	3.00	6.10		
<b>Parking – minimum</b>					
Residential	<b>4 *</b>	9	9		
Visitor	1	1	1		
<b>Bicycle parking stalls – minimum</b>					
Class 1	16	14	14		
Class 2	6	6	6		

### Sustainability Features

The applicant has not identified any sustainability features associated with this proposal.

### Consistency with Policies and Design Guidelines

#### Official Community Plan

The subject property is designated Core Residential in the *Official Community Plan* (OCP, 2012), which supports a diverse range of housing types including low and mid-rise multi-unit residential buildings. The OCP also identifies this property within Development Permit Area 3 (HC): Core Mixed Use Residential, which supports a “high-quality of architecture, landscape and urban design that reflects the function of a major residential centre on the edge of a central business district in scale, massing and character.” The design guidelines contained in the *Downtown Core Area Plan* (DCAP), *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings* (1981), and *Guidelines for Fences, Gates and Shutters* (2010) apply to the proposed building.

#### Neighbourhood Plan

The subject property is within the Residential Mixed-Use District in the *Downtown Core Area Plan* (DCAP), which supports multi-residential development up to six-storeys and a floor space ratio up to 2:1. The proposal for a four-storey multi-unit residential building with a FSR of 1.38:1 complies with the height and density policies outlined in DCAP.

## Regulatory Considerations

Proposing a four-storey building on a lot with a site area of 671.5m<sup>2</sup> is tight and compromises the site planning with respect to providing sufficient landscaping and open site space, as well as impacting the relationship with adjacent properties and influencing the redevelopment of those lots in the future. By comparison, the standard R3-1 Zone requires a minimum lot area of 920.00m<sup>2</sup> and allows a maximum FSR of 1.2:1 for a four-storey building. The zone also incorporates larger setbacks to allow for some breathing room between neighbouring buildings.

A new, site-specific zone would be required to facilitate this development, and variances for setbacks, site coverage and open site space would be required. The regulations in the new zone would be similar to the R3-1 Zone, Multiple Dwelling District, except for the density provisions. The following variances would be required:

- reduce the front yard setback from 10.50m to 2m
- reduce the side (east) yard setback from 6.10m to 1.52m
- reduce the side (west) yard setback from 6.10m to 3.64m
- increase site coverage from 30% to 43%
- reduce open site space from 30% to 15.30%.

## ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The following sections identify and provide a brief analysis of the areas where the Panel is requested to provide commentary.

### Overall Size, Scale and Massing

The OCP contains design guidelines that speak to the overall massing of a building and its visual impact on the site and adjacent properties. The building is long and presents a large volume on a 672m<sup>2</sup> lot. The side yard setback along the east side is only 1.5m from the property line, which would impact future development, window placement and access to sunlight on the adjacent property. The Panel's input on the overall size, scale and massing of the proposed building would be welcomed.

### Window Size, Shape and Placement

The *Advisory Design Guidelines for Buildings, Signs and Awnings* contain a design guideline pertaining to building fenestration and the importance of arrangement, proportion and pattern of windows, as well as the relationship between solids and voids. The applicant is proposing substantial glazing on the third and fourth storeys along the north and south elevations; however, the windows at the ground level and second storey are smaller and present a different pattern compared to the upper storeys. A repetitive window placement along the west and east elevations is being proposed. The ADP's input on window size, shape and placement would be welcomed.

### Landscaping and Outdoor Open Space

*Appendix 7: Building Design Guidelines* in the Downtown Core Area Plan (DCAP) encourages on-site open space such as courtyards, forecourts, plazas, patios, gardens, roof top patios/gardens for high density residential buildings that is well-designed, safe, active, visible and illuminated to encourage their use. The DCAP also encourages residential dwelling units to have direct access or views of the onsite open space. The applicant is proposing no on-site

open space or soft landscaping (plants or trees). Hardscape pavers would be introduced throughout the site and the rear yard would be a surface parking lot. The Panel's input on landscaping and outdoor open space would be welcomed.

### **Entryways and Articulation along the Building Base**

The design guidelines outlined in *Appendix 7: Building Design Guidelines* of the DCAP encourage building entrances that are clearly identifiable from the street, and ground floor residential dwellings located adjacent to a street that provide at-grade individual entrances with direct connections to the public sidewalk, in addition to visually articulated designs and quality architectural materials and detailing in building bases, to enhance visual interest for pedestrians. One of the ground floor dwelling units and the main residential entryway would be facing the street. The ADP's input on the entryways and articulation along the building base would be welcomed.

### **Transition between the Public and Private Realm**

*Appendix 7: Building Design Guidelines* in the DCAP contains a design guideline that encourages raised terraces, forecourts, landscaping, screening fences and gates to enhance residential entrances and to assist with distinguishing between the public and private realm. The Panel's input on the transition between the public and private realm and the influence this may have on the proposed entryways would be welcomed.

### **OPTIONS**

The following are three potential options that the Panel may consider using or modifying in formulating a recommendation to Council:

#### **Option One**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road be approved as presented.

#### **Option Two**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road be approved with the following changes:

- as listed by the ADP.

#### **Option Three**

That the Advisory Design Panel recommend to Council that Development Permit Application No. 000506 for 953 Balmoral Road does not sufficiently meet the applicable design guidelines and polices and should be declined (and that the key areas that should be revised include):

- as listed by the ADP, if there is further advice they would like to provide on how the Application could be improved.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Subject Map
- Aerial Map

- Plans date stamped January 18, 2018
- Letter to Mayor and Council dated November 10, 2017
- Letter to Mayor and Council dated May 7, 2018
- Letter to Mayor and Council dated August 17, 2018.

cc: Mr. Rajinder Sahota of Method Built Homes; Ms. Pamela Úbeda of Coast and Beam.